

REMARKS

After entry of the above amendments, claims 4-12, 15-16, and 19-22 will be pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 13-14, and 17-18 have been cancelled. Claims 4, 6-7, 9, and 19 have been amended to delete unnecessary language, to explicitly recite what was implicit, and/or to correct informalities. New claims 21-22 have been added. Support for the claim amendments and the new claims can be found, for instance, in the claims as originally filed and in the specification. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any cancelled claim and any amended claim in its original form in a continuation application. No new matter has been added.

Claims 4-5 and 21

Claims 4-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner rejected the use of the term “developed.” Applicant has amended claim 4 to recite the term “copied” as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4, and the claims that depend therefrom, satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 4 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0182500 to Raves et al. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raves in view of APA.

Claim 4, as amended, recites “wherein the second partition includes an unoccupied area onto which a specific application already stored in the second partition is copied when the specific application is executed from among the applications requiring write protection.”

In the Office action, the Examiner states:

Raves teaches a **storage device for retaining data 130 (figure 3) where in the storage device includes: a first partition 131 which operates in a user environment** (user is accessing the system and partition is booted originally - ¶26), and a **second partition 132 different from the first partition, the second partition storing applications (APP 1 and APP 2 as shown in figure 3) requiring write protection (¶26).** Further Raves teaches **wherein the second partition includes an unoccupied area** (i.e. area in which to store writes as the second partition is unlocked and able to accept writes from the Applications 1 and 2) **in which a specific application (either application 1 and 2) is able to be developed** (i.e. copied [via the mirror creation - ¶26] and run as APP 1 and APP 2 are taught to be in ¶26) **when the specific application is executed from among the applications requiring write protected** (as explicitly stated in ¶26).

(June 27, 2006 Office action, pg. 5).

Although Raves discusses copying applications in partition 131 onto partition 132, Raves does not disclose, teach, or suggest copying an application already stored in partition 132 onto an unoccupied area in partition 132, resulting in partition 132 having two copies of an application. In contrast, claim 4 recites “the second partition includes an unoccupied area onto which a specific application already stored in the second partition is copied.” In other words, the second partition includes two copies of the specific application, which is illustrated in the example shown in Figure 5 of the present application.

Therefore, Raves does not disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein the second partition includes an unoccupied area onto which a specific application already stored in the second

partition is copied when the specific application is executed from among the applications requiring write protection,” as recited in claim 4.

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Raves. Since the APA does not cure the deficiencies of Raves, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4, and the claims that depend therefrom, are further patentable over Raves in view of the APA.

Claims 6-8

Claims 6-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,660 to Milne et al., in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0051090 to Bonnett et al., and further in view of APA. The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the Office action, the Examiner states:

Milne further teaches **virtual application area forming code** (part of the code of the boot manager program that is responsible for loading the PC Services software [figure 5, step 130]) **which copies the predetermined application onto a predetermined area of an unoccupied area in said memory** (inherently the area must be unoccupied as the PC Services application is being loaded into the memory in order to be executed – [5/57-58] and [5/40-44] – refer also to the discussion of claim 1 above) **which forms a virtual application area when the predetermined application is the validated application** (as discussed above in the discussion of claim 1 where Hennessy teaches that the system memory utilized as virtual memory when applications are loaded therein).

(June 27, 2006 Office action, pgs. 9-10).

However, claim 6, as amended, recites “virtual application area forming code which copies the predetermined application onto an unoccupied area within the second area, and which forms a virtual application area when the predetermined application is the validated application.” In other words, the predetermined application is copied onto another part of the storage device, not the memory. Since Milne only discusses loading the PC Services application into memory, it fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim element.

Given that neither Bonnett nor APA cures the deficiencies of Milne, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Milne, in view of Bonnett, and further in view of the APA based at least on the reasons above.

Claims 9-12

Claims 9-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,660 to Milne et al., in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0051090 to Bonnett et al., and further in view of APA.

In the Office action, the Examiner states:

Milne teaches an **application access module** (host processor 16 – figure 1) **that is coupled to both said storage device 14 (as shown) and said BIOS** (as is inherent and well known that the processor begins boot-up of the system by accessing and executing the BIOS code) **which copies** (as the processor is known in the art as being responsible for loading data from the hard drive 14 to the system memory 17) **the application in the host protected area 56 onto an unoccupied** (inherent as discussed above in claim 6) **area of another memory 17 [5/57-58] thus generating a virtual application area** (as also discussed above with relation to Hennessy).

(June 27, 2006 Office action, pg. 11).

However, claim 9, as amended, recites “an application access module coupled to the storage device and the BIOS, the application access module copies the application in the host protected area onto an unoccupied area of the host protected area to generate a virtual application area.” Thus, the application is copied onto another part of the storage device, not the memory. Since Milne only discusses loading data from the hard drive to the memory, it fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim element.

Given that neither Bonnett nor APA cures the deficiencies of Milne, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Milne, in view of Bonnett, and further in view of the APA based at least on the reasons above.

Claims 15-16

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 15-16 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 19-20 and 22

Claim 19 has been objected to on the basis of informalities. In particular, the Examiner objected to the recitation of the term “computer usable medium.” Applicant has amended claim 19 to recite the term “computer readable medium” as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 19.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 19-20 would be allowable over the prior art of record if Applicant overcomes the claim objections. In light of the


above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19, and the claims that depend therefrom, have overcome the claim objections and are in proper form for allowance.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: October 27, 2006



Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540